

## **REMARKS**

1. Claim 1-16 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 17-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant is grateful for the indication that claim 9 would be allowable if placed in independent form and including the limitations of all intervening claims. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant requests reexamination of the application.

2. Rejection under §102b. Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Independent claim 1 has been amended in a manner analogous to the Examiner's helpful suggestions, and now recites that a second trap at least partially comprises fish bone char. Claims 2-6, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

3. Rejection under §103a. Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648) in view of Hong (U.S. Patent 5,665,240). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 7 has been amended and is now in independent form. Casolo does not disclose a phosphate used in a trap for organic materials. Hong discloses the use of a "slightly soluble" phosphate for precipitation of lead from drinking water. Such a "slightly soluble" phosphate is a powder and would be rapidly consumed. As a result, such a "slightly soluble phosphate" of Hong is ill

suited to large scale wastewater treatment. Hong teaches away from large particle sizes with the requirement that the phosphate be "slightly soluble". Applicant's claim is directed towards an adsorption apparatus for treatment of wastewater, and typically the traps are exposed to high volumes of wastewater. Therefore it is highly preferable (in embodiments that use a phosphate) that the phosphate be insoluble. Other advantages of low mesh materials are recited on page 3 in the Background of Applicant's application. Claim 8, dependent from claim 7, further recites that a second trap at least partially comprises a phosphate having a particle size of greater than 20/60 mesh. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 13 has been amended in a manner analogous to Claim 1, and now recites a second trap at least partially comprising fish bone char. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 13 be withdrawn.

4. Rejection under §103a. Claim 8 stands rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648) in view of Szczepanik (U.S. Patent 4,902,427). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 8 is dependent from claim 7 which is allowable over Casolo and Hong for the reasons discussed above. Nothing in Szczepanik teaches or suggests this combination of elements. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

5. Rejection under §103a. Claim 11 stands rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648) in view of Schlegel et al (US Publication 2002/0053547). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1 which is allowable over Casolo for the reasons discussed above. Nothing in Schlegel et al teaches or suggests this combination of elements. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

6. Rejection under §103a. Claim 12 stands rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648) in view of Faylor et al (US Patent 3,870,033). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 12 is dependent from claim 1 which is allowable over Casolo for the reasons discussed above. Nothing in Faylor et al teaches or suggests this combination of elements. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

7. Rejection under §103a. Claim 14 stands rejected over Casolo (U.S. Patent 3,985,648) and Hong (U.S. Patent 5,665,240) and further in view of Faylor et al (US Patent 3,870,033). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 14 is dependent from claim 13 which is allowable for the reasons discussed above. Nothing in Faylor et al teaches or suggests this combination of elements. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

The additional citations made of record and not relied upon by the Examiner have been considered by the Applicant. None is seen, either alone or in combination, to teach or suggest the present invention. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Geary G. Parke



Robert Kelley Roth  
Attorney for Applicants  
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone  
150 W. Jefferson, Suite 2500  
Detroit, MI 48226  
313-496-7568  
313-496-8454 (fax)  
[roth@millercanfield.com](mailto:roth@millercanfield.com)



#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being sent via first class mail on December 9, 2004 to the Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

12/09/04  
Date of Signature  
DELIB:2560438.1\107725-00006

By: 